

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

DIVISION OF TOWN PLANNING

ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDING

Nov. 30, 1937



RECEIVED

NOV 3 1937

DOCUMENTS
COLLECTION

DOCUMENTS COLLECTION
MASSACHUSETTS LIBRARY
DIVISION OF DOCUMENTS
TREASURY DEPT.

	Page
COMPREHENSIVE ZONING	3
BALANCED ZONING	4
ZONING AND LIBERTY	5
SUBDIVISION CONTROL	6
MASTER PLAN	7
STATISTICS	9



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE DIVISION OF TOWN PLANNING

WALTER V. MCCARTHY, *Commissioner*
EDWARD T. HARTMAN, *Consultant on Planning*

ADVISORY BOARD

MORRIS BRONSTEIN, Boston
GEORGE CROMPTON, Worcester
MRS. ANNA E. PIGEON, Belmont
MRS. MARY T. ROBERTS, Chestnut Hill
DR. HARRY C. SOLOMON, Boston
FREDERICK P. SCHMID, Roslindale

REPORT OF THE DIVISION ON TOWN PLANNING

This year 13 new planning boards have been established, all under the provisions of chapter 211 of the Acts of 1936. They are Adams, Chelmsford, Dennis, Dracut, Hampden, Harwich, Lincoln, Nahant, Petersham, Russell, Seekonk, Sherborn, and South Hadley. Adams and Nahant had boards at some time in the past, but they have had none for several years. This makes 139 boards in all, 69 of them being in towns of under 10,000 inhabitants. Ipswich established a planning board and within a few weeks annulled the action.

Attleboro, Concord, Haverhill, Milford, Natick, Paxton, Saugus, Swampscott, Wellesley, and Winthrop re-established their boards under chapter 211 of 1936, while Brookline accepted the provisions of that act adding subdivision control to the powers of its board of survey. This gives this new power to 24 places.

The 139 boards with new, or only the original, powers have definite duties to perform. It has been said that they are handicapped by opposition, by indifference, by niggardly appropriations and no trained assistance. It is also stated that failure is due to board members who lack interest, initiative, vigor, courage, or have a too narrow view of their task. For these and other reasons one of our boards floundered for several years. Then a new chairman, with many of the required qualities, put himself to the task of creating a board. A mid-term vacancy gave a chance to hand-pick a man with special ability. A sympathetic but uninterested member was persuaded to resign. Another hand-picked member was added. The reconstituted board went to work. It secured Federal aid, it showed officials and people what it planned to do, the value of the work, and received a town appropriation. At the last town meeting all its proposals were adopted with enthusiasm. The whole town is on the way, and it knows where it is going. The officials, including the planning board, are a team, cheered by an interested citizenry. Let others do likewise.

Action along zoning lines has not been very marked; but it is significant that Peabody and Watertown substituted comprehensive laws for elementary laws, the replaced law in Peabody being the so-called interim type, and that in Watertown an elementary zoning law. Canton and Nahant in their second effort, former attempts being some ten years ago, succeeded in adopting more or less comprehensive zoning. Chatham and Yarmouth, in their second efforts, were unsuccessful. Significant action in the way of improving more or less elementary laws was taken in Belmont, Sudbury, Wellesley and Weston. Belmont acted upon 9 constructive amendments, adopting all. One raised about a third of the area of the town from 10,000- to 15,000-foot lot areas; and the other 8 raised various areas from a lower to a higher classification, business to residential or general residence to single residence.

Greenfield and Southborough prepared zoning schemes but postponed action for one year. Some time ago Hudson substituted a more complete for an elementary law and Franklin adopted an elementary law, but neither was published and the results were lost.

Sudbury established 20,000-foot minimum lot sizes for the entire town; Wellesley, 10,000-foot lot sizes for the entire town, and is now studying the situation with a view to increased sizes in certain areas; Weston, with a 10,000-foot provision, left this requirement for the small general residence area and divided the remainder of the town between 20,000, 30,000 and 40,000-foot requirements, the latter covering about 75 percent of the area of the town. The new Nahant law provides for 5,000 and 10,000-foot lots; the Watertown law for 5,000 and 8,000-foot lots; and the Peabody law for 6,000, 10,000 and 15,000-foot lots. This means that 7 places have taken constructive action, some of it very far-reaching, in regard to minimum lot sizes.

Along with such official action, a number of subdividers are developing large areas with lots ranging from 12,000 to 20,000 square feet in size. This all tends towards what people are seeking; spaciousness—light, air, privacy and fire protection; durability—livability, protection from intrusions and stable economic and social values.

Some of these constructive amendments were adopted with enthusiasm. With like enthusiasm other places weakened their laws, and their protection, by punching their laws full of holes.

A zoning law is, like a suit of clothes, intended for protection. If a suit of clothes has poor fabric and many holes, the wise action is to replace it, as did Peabody and Watertown. If its fabric is good and will hold patches, wise action covers the holes, as did Belmont, Sudbury, Wellesley, and Weston. It is an unwise town that will tear new holes in its protective suit, with an uproar of derisive yells. Too many places with meager protection receive a steady succession of pleas for more rending, and rarely reject one. It has become a habit, a habit difficult to overcome. These places are zoned, but they are zoneless, their protective suit riddled. Their future is in the past.

COMPREHENSIVE ZONING

There are very few comprehensive zoning laws. Many are so listed which are so only in part. Some have "use" features plus lot sizes, or yard provisions, or height and coverage provisions. The major mistakes have been made in regard to height and coverage. Given a certain width of streets, it is impotent to provide that in business, or any other, districts the height limit shall be 200 feet and the coverage 100 percent. To mean anything, height and coverage must bear a relationship to the street widths. In reality, there should be different height and coverage limits for every variance in street widths. The Chicago Regional Planning Association recommends for the entire area outside of Chicago, business and industrial buildings no higher than half the width of the street. The purpose of such regulations is to ensure that what is built upon private land may be serviced by the streets, as to traffic clearance, light and ventilation, fire protection, etc. When height and coverage provisions permit twice what the streets can service, the provisions are meaningless.

Since zoning laws were first established it has been learned that there are many needs and possibilities which were at first undiscovered or not considered. A city or town with only use zoning is in for much trouble. For the cities, except Boston, there is a state law limiting height to 125 feet; but no city has a street system which will service buildings of that uniform height. There is no height limit in towns unless established under a building or zoning law.

Comprehensive zoning provides for a well-considered system of use regulations; bulk regulations, arrived at through height, and coverage; yard and court provisions; vision clearance; and, in residence districts, minimum lot sizes, front, side and rear yards, percentage of lot coverage; and, everywhere, regulation of accessory and nonconforming uses, and full provision for all desired administrative features. There are many uses which belong in certain districts, but which it is not safe to

admit indiscriminately. Garages, filling stations, saloons, and other uses, permitted in business districts, should not be allowed within certain distances from schools, churches and other institutions, and from residence districts bordering on business districts. These prohibitions may be made definite. There are many uses for which this method is not adapted, and for which special regulations must be provided. If they are not provided, the building inspector must issue a permit. No town, and but few cities, should have unrestricted districts. Varying according to the nature of the place, certain notoriously noxious industries may be barred by name, while others should be admitted only after a hearing by the board of appeals and a finding that in the location selected they will do no damage. The same method must be used in regard to the removal of earth products from residence districts. The resulting conditions after the operation is completed, the methods of handling material at the site and of transporting it through the town are all important items. Consideration is being given to hospitals for the insane, schools and custodial homes for the feeble-minded, fraternity houses (often only so called), music and dancing schools, and numerous other uses which frequently make life miserable for all unfortunate enough to live in the vicinity.

A new conception is essential in regard to mercantile buildings, where there is much loading and unloading of trucks. These buildings, more often than not, are located on narrow streets. There must be a limitation of coverage, to provide light, air, access for fire-fighting apparatus, and loading space; or loading rooms must be provided. These latter are much inferior to the former. But to propose a limitation of coverage, which will allow a town to function effectively, will be rigorously fought, because there are two or three small blocks surrounded by narrow streets where the owners want a 100-percent-coverage privilege. So all are given the privilege; and conditions go from bad to worse, finally to stagnation. It is pointed out that many merchants are actively competing with their would-be customers by occupying all possible parking space with trucks and their own and their employee's private cars. In one town a study showed that 83 percent of the reasonably available space was so occupied.

BALANCED ZONING

Comprehensive zoning must be also balanced zoning. When a city has five to ten times as much land zoned for business as it can ever use, it can't pretend to have balanced zoning. Most of our zoning is unbalanced. In places where it is worst there comes a constant succession of requests for what will make it more unbalanced. By acceding to these, cities and towns are perpetuating blight.

Balanced zoning means zoning that gives to industry and business, to apartments and general residence, such amounts of space as conscientious land-use studies show to be necessary. Probable growth should be considered. But the population curve is flattening out. Industrial and business zones are far too large. It has been said that areas now actually in use for these purposes are enough to meet the needs for all time. Were we to develop substantial buildings where every shack store, every monitor building, now stands, make the new buildings two or three stories high, there is no doubt but that the surmise would be correct.

Balanced zoning is arousing much interest, as we pointed out last year. But its value and justice is not yet generally understood. A local editor recently said that the law for his town was awkward, unfair, inequitable, and loose; and that it should be changed. It happens that a major highway runs through this town. It runs through land only slightly developed, a considerable distance from the two village and trading centers and from the developed residential areas. The editor's suggestion is that the land along this highway should be used for business purposes.

There are already developed business areas elsewhere, sufficient to more than meet the needs of the town. Moreover, a full and substantial development of the land involved would meet all the business needs of 100,000 people. There are less than one-sixth that many people in the town. To zone the area for business would accommodate very few of the local people, would injure businesses already established, and would result in what the English call a ribbon or shoestring

development. It would mean a few indifferent, tax-payer units scattered along the way, most of them making no money. It would give a very bad impression to people passing through and injure the reputation of the town. It would mean unbalanced zoning to a marked degree. It would not create values but would injure values of much adjacent land. The solution of this problem lies in making this main way a freeway, as pointed out in our report for 1935.

There is a rapidly growing belief that zoning laws must be rewritten. Every planning board should carefully consider its zoning law and gradually, or at once, provide zoning that is balanced and comprehensive.

It was not a crime to write poor zoning laws in the beginning. Poor administration of poor laws was not a crime, except in cases where criminal action took place. But now that we know the possibilities of good zoning and how to do it, it is a crime not to write good laws; and it is a crime to permit or even condone faulty administration. If as communities we have not enacted efficient laws, it is up to us to do so, and then to see that no administrator is so ignorant, or careless, or venal as to permit the laws to fail of their purpose.

ZONING AND LIBERTY

Lincoln said: "The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as his liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act, as the destroyer of liberty, . . . Plainly the sheep and the wolf are not agreed on a definition of the word liberty; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures."

To accomplish a desired purpose, whether it be to achieve a new ideal or to correct a wrong, a plan must be worked out and put into effect. But every such proposal is opposed by those who profit by no change and those who oppose change merely because it is change. They do this in the name of Liberty, whereas there can be no liberty without progress and the correction of wrongs. To regulate automobile drivers so as to save lives and property, to regulate the stock market to protect innocent investors, to require pure foods and drugs for the welfare of the people, to do any one of a thousand things, interferes with the liberty of someone, but is essential for the liberty of all. If I may not poison your child, by a like token you may not poison mine. We have to mutually agree to a limitation of our liberties, all people have to so agree in the interests of all. It is necessary if we are to achieve any kind of social purpose, if we are to improve conditions or to stop injurious trends or to become civilized.

A chief purpose of zoning is to protect property values and to promote the public welfare. Because of the trends of the time, very largely because of the development of the automobile, it has become imperatively necessary to take action, to regulate, to protect. It is unfortunate, therefore, to have a town counsel say that zoning simmers down to managing the use of your neighbor's property rather than your own, and that nowadays everyone has more rights to land than the man who pays taxes on it; or to have a citizen say that zoning is a noose around the neck of better business, and ask whether this is Austria or free America; or to hear a town clerk say that he fought through the four years of the Civil War in the name of liberty, and that he did not now propose to surrender his liberty. The gentlemen highwaymen of England and the pirates of the sea used the same arguments when their liberties were being curbed.

One has only to contrast our towns, their appearance and their prosperity, to learn that there is some meaning to a sound scheme of growth, and become convinced that all people must be regulated in the interest of all. That this is so is asserted by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, the investment bankers, the insurance companies, the public utilities, in fact by every major group in the country. They can't all be wrong.

A town meeting was recently considering a zoning law. A citizen, supposedly intelligent and public-spirited, said he believed in zoning but that the law proposed was needlessly drastic and unreasonable and he would have nothing to do with it. The law was submitted to the National Association of Real Estate Boards for an opinion. It referred the law to its expert, a man nationally known for his

sound work; and he replied:—"While I am not familiar with the conditions in, I do not consider this by-law to be unreasonable or needlessly exacting in details. I have a summer home in the village of, which, I judge, is rather similar in size and conditions to I would be most happy to see a zoning ordinance in of the type proposed in" The town for which the by-law was proposed is preeminently a summer town. It rejected the by-law in the name of liberty.

"Zoning permits, or requires, group action which limits individual liberty, to acquire greater liberty and stability for the whole group." Ray B. Haight.

In *West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish*, Chief Justice Hughes said:—"Liberty in each of its phases has its history and connotation. But the liberty safeguarded is liberty in a social organization which requires the protection of law against the evils which menace the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the people." In *Morehead v. Tipaldo*, he said:—"Liberty implies the absence of arbitrary restraint, not immunity from reasonable regulations and prohibitions imposed in the interests of the community."

Joseph Lee once said that "If the lover of 'liberty' could go back and pass a year in some city of the middle ages, where freedom from sanitary law was given a fair chance to show what it could do, where the ignorance and laziness of each citizen had free scope to accomplish their perfect work,—I think that after such an experience the most ardent apostle of liberty in the negative sense would return with the conviction that after all the Black Death, the plague, cholera and smallpox are a class of tyrants whose rule is, upon the whole, more to be dreaded than that of the board of health."

SUBDIVISION CONTROL

Twenty-four (24) places now have the power of subdivision control under the new law. All boards should have this power. All that is necessary is a vote to re-establish the board under the provisions of General Laws, ch. 41, sec. 81A, as added by ch. 211, 1936; and a vote to accept the provisions of 81F to 81J, inclusive, as above added. The first step after power is secured is to adopt rules as to how subdivision plans shall be prepared and filed, and as to procedure under the law. These rules should cover:—

Scale and size of sheet.

Specify all data to be provided.

Streets—general requirements as to connections, width, grade, drainage, etc.

That streets shall be developed to a prescribed extent, that certain utilities shall be installed under prescribed conditions, and that all town-provided utilities shall be installed at a specified stage of the development.

Block sizes.

Lot size requirements if not otherwise covered.

Some stipulation in regard to land unfit for homes, because of swampy or other conditions.

In regard to urban land use, probably the most destructive work, economically and socially, ever done has been through unnecessary and faulty subdivisions. The country is filled with areas, urban, suburban, and even rural, where blight is rampant. The subdivider, the town and the purchaser all suffer. Control is coming, in most places a hundred or more years too late. But there is opposition from the unthinking and purely selfish. They say it is too much power to give any public body. One chairman replies that full power now exists, but it is all in the hands of the subdivider, who has complete power to make or mar, to create or butcher, and that most of it has been butchery. He urges that this power be given to towns, so that they may direct development in the interests of all. A new area with the whole layout as it should be, good approach, properly constructed streets and utilities, good design and honest construction of homes; all will give beauty, livability, contentment, and provide a stability of values which is now being demanded by all thinking people. The day of wild-cat land speculation and land butchery should end. The only way to end it is to stop it. It is a cancer. Towns will stop it or it will kill them.

The proper design of new neighborhood units, or the redesign of existing ones, requires care, training, balanced judgment, a sense of direction, definiteness of purpose, and enough backbone to prevent the track of the directing authority from resembling that of an inebriate or a paralytic. Towns should control the quantity as well as the quality of subdivisions. A good but entirely unnecessary subdivision is injurious. When almost all of Kansas and Nebraska was being subdivided a legislator proposed that at least every tenth section of land be reserved for agriculture. Too much and too bad are still the prevailing faults of subdivision work.

Street widths should fit the purpose and needs of the area. It is high time to lay out neighborhood units that are to remain neighborhood units. They must be held inviolate from intrusions, and there must be no anticipation of street widening that will break down the area. Some streets should have but 12 feet of surfaced area, the remaining open space being reserved for grass, shrubs, and trees. Such units should invite no through traffic. It would be better to allow no through traffic, by having but one entrance, leading from the major way of approach, to be used by residents, visitors, and those servicing the area. The butchery of children, and adults, could thus be ended.

The cul-de-sac is frowned upon. Today it is the safest and most comfortable location for a home. Its worst form is a dead-end street with a turning space. Its ideal form is a neighborhood unit, a glorified cul-de-sac. Such a unit should be large enough to require a school of reasonable size. It should be developed as a "greenbelt" unit, the greenbelt insulating it from the hazards and annoyance of the main way of approach. We never yet have designed, much less built, a genuine automobile-age town. The prevailing slaughter of people, money, and amenity is the result. Billions of money are going into more machines, more roads, all designed for more destruction of life and property. The Juggernaut and its way run through mangled bodies, a mangled countryside—the results of a mangled intelligence.

The first step for a planning board under the new law is to prepare itself for a sound and efficient administration of the subdivision control features. Land butchering much stop, because, as a capable subdivider says,—“We all want it to stop.” This same man said that the most effective sales point was that a subdivision is sound and properly developed, with the facts proven—not merely said to be so.

One of the best methods of securing control of needless and fatally expensive (to the town) developments is to require a proper development of the streets and the essential utilities. This is the only way to avoid the wasteful and unsocial results which come from our usual method of butchering land.

MASTER PLAN

While proper subdivision control depends much upon a sound master plan, the latter cannot be worked out at once. It is an evolution, requiring intelligent and continuous study and adaptation. The master plan will contain many elements which will affect the success of a subdivision, and essential data should be collected as soon as possible. All wise subdividers will be guided by such data. Otherwise they may find their efforts, and money, wasted. The town, and lot purchasers, stand to lose as well. Replanning is far more expensive than planning. Bad subdivision work penalizes purchasers in many ways, a chief one being betterment assessments, or going without what the assessments would provide. Some states require a master plan before subdivision control may be exercised. Both are essential to good work, and local boards should be guided by this.

A major street plan should be studied at once. It is essential if a board is to be able to foresee how a subdivision fits into the general plan. New streets in the major plan should be laid down on the map, as nearly as possible where they should go, if and when needed. They should be carefully coordinated with the existing center or centers and other main ways leading to other towns. With these ways studied, a board may begin subdivision control with some accuracy.

When a subdivision is related to a proposed major way, the way should be surveyed and fixed on the map.

Subdivisions and all elements of the master plan, to be accurately guided, require basic data which should be secured at an early date. We may but outline some of these needs. Some will be more important in one place, others in other places. Some will be needed here and not at all there. Much of the material is already available and needs but to be collected, tabulated, spotted on a map, or otherwise made usable. Some features are:—

A town map—a tool needed for all features.

Width, grades and types of construction of streets.

Zoning map fully up to date.

Land use survey.

Assessments and land values map.

Water supply system.

Sewers.

Surface and storm drainage.

Public buildings, with emphasis on schools.

Parks, playgrounds, and other open spaces.

Electric light and power system.

Gas system.

Telephone system.

Contour map.

Special map data and other data should include:—

Population spot map.

Expenditures—classified.

School population spot map.

Taxable values.

Income—amount and sources.

These, possibly other, data will be used in forecasting trends and needs. The physical, economic and social problems of the town may be studied, their trends predicted, when this information is at hand. Total and school populations should be recorded for several past decades, and predicted for future decades. Many influences affecting population must be recognized. Income, expenditures, taxable values and other features should be listed for past decades and estimated for future decades.

With data of this nature in usable shape, a planning board need not wander in the dark. With no data, it will exercise no leadership, it will serve no purpose, it should not exist. There are men and women who can and will do the necessary work. Each town should find them and aid them, or not pretend to do planning work.

A master plan, it will be seen, is a continuing, perpetual process, not a fixed thing. For example, it is seen that a new school will be needed in five or more years. Past and present trends indicate that it should go here and be of a certain size. By the time it is built it is found that it should go there, some distance from the first point, and be of a different size. This is planning, not drift. It costs a little money and some work. It saves millions.

A high school was built, by rule of thumb. Incapable men did it. Its chemical laboratory had no water connection. In its first year of use classes were held in the corridors. It was a mess, no object of pride, notably inefficient. This is drifting, not planning.

PLANNING BOARD ACTIVITIES

BOARDS ESTABLISHED

Adams	Danvers	Lawrence	North Attleborough	Stoughton*
Amesbury	Dartmouth*	Lenox*	Northbridge*	Sudbury*
Amherst*	Dedham	Leominster	Norwood	Swampscott
Andover*	Deerfield*	Lexington*	Oak Bluffs*	Taunton
Arlington	Dennis*	Lincoln*	Paxton*	Tisbury*
Ashland*	Dracut*	Longmeadow*	Peabody	Wakefield
Attleboro	Duxbury*	Lowell	Petersham*	Walpole*
Athol	Easthampton	Lynn	Pittsfield	Waltham
Auburn*	East Longmeadow*	Lynnfield*	Plymouth	Watertown
Barnstable*	Everett	Malden	Quincy	Wayland*
Bedford*	Fairhaven	Manchester*	Randolph*	Webster
Belmont	Fall River	Mansfield*	Reading*	Wellesley
Beverly	Falmouth*	Marblehead*	Revere	Westborough*
Billerica*	Fitchburg	Medfield*	Russell*	West Boylston*
Boston	Frammingham	Medford	Salem	Westfield
Bourne*	Franklin*	Melrose	Saugus	Weston*
Braintree	Gardner	Methuen	Scituate*	West Springfield
Bridgewater*	Gloucester	Middleborough*	Seekonk*	Westwood*
Brookton	Great Barrington*	Milford	Sharon*	Weymouth
Brookline	Greenfield	Millis*	Sherborn*	Whitman*
Cambridge	Hampden*	Milton	Shrewsbury*	Wilbraham*
Canton*	Hanover*	Nahant*	Somerville	Wilmington*
Carlisle*	Harwich*	Natick	Southborough*	Winchester
Chatham*	Haverhill	Needham	Southbridge	Winthrop
Chelmsford*	Hingham*	New Bedford	South Hadley*	Woburn
Chicopee	Holyoke	Newton	Springfield	Worcester
Clinton	Hudson*	North Adams	Stockbridge*	Yarmouth*
Concord*	Hull*	Northampton	Stoneham	

* Under 10,000 population.

NO BOARDS: Chelsea, Marlborough, Newburyport.

CITIES AND TOWNS WHICH HAVE BEEN ZONED

COMPREHENSIVE		COMPREHENSIVE—Continued		PARTIAL	
Brookton	Nov., 1920	Lynnfield	Nov., 1929	Marshfield	June, 1926
Brookline	May, 1922	Wilbraham	Feb., 1931	Fall River	Sept., 1927
Longmeadow	July, 1922	Natick	Mar., 1931		
Springfield	Dec., 1922	Hull	Mar., 1931		
Newton	Dec., 1922	Westfield	Aug., 1931		
West Springfield	May, 1923	Great Barrington	Mar., 1932		
Cambridge	Jan., 1924	Carlisle	Feb., 1933	Amesbury	
Lexington	Mar., 1924	Sharon	Mar., 1933	Amherst	
Melrose	Mar., 1924	Dover	Mar., 1933	Attleboro	
Winchester	Mar., 1924	Wilmington	July, 1934	Beverly	
Arlington	May, 1924	Wayland	Sept., 1934	Billerica	
Boston	June, 1924	Watertown	Jan., 1936	Bourne	
Woburn	Jan., 1925	Andover	Mar., 1936	Braintree	
Belmont	Jan., 1925	Peabody	Feb., 1937	Chatham	
Needham	Mar., 1925	Canton	Mar., 1937	Chelsea	
Walpole	Mar., 1925	Nahant	Mar., 1937	Chicopee	
Stoneham	Mar., 1925	Wellesley	Mar., 1937	Clinton	
Waltham	July, 1925	Sudbury	Mar., 1937	Duxbury	
Haverhill	Oct., 1925			Easthampton	
Medford	Oct., 1925	Use		Fitchburg	
Wakefield	Nov., 1925	Milton	July, 1922	Frammingham	
North Adams	Dec., 1925	Holyoke	Sept., 1923	Gardner	
Somerville	Dec., 1925	Swampscott	Apr., 1924	Greenfield	
New Bedford	Dec., 1925	Dedham	May, 1924	Hingham	
Fairhaven	Feb., 1926	Chelsea	June, 1924	Leominster	
Falmouth	Apr., 1926	Paxton	Dec., 1924	Littleton	
Reading	May, 1926	Worcester	Dec., 1924	Manchester	
Lynn	June, 1926	Salem	Nov., 1925	Marion	
Lowell	July, 1926	Hudson	Mar., 1927	Medfield	
Malden	July, 1926	Bedford	Mar., 1928	Middleborough	
Everett	July, 1926	Middleton	Apr., 1933	Northampton	
Norwood	May, 1927	Stockbridge	Feb., 1934	North Attleborough	
Gloucester	Nov., 1927	Scituate	Mar., 1936	Plymouth	
Pittsfield	Dec., 1927			Quincy	
Marblehead	Apr., 1928	INTERIM		Shrewsbury	
Weston	Apr., 1928	Taunton	Sept., 1925	Southborough	
Concord	Apr., 1928	Marlborough	Jan., 1927	Southbridge	
Agawam	Apr., 1928	Petersham	Mar., 1927	Wenham	
East Longmeadow	Apr., 1928	Oak Bluffs	Apr., 1927	Westborough	
Saugus	June, 1928	Northampton	Sept., 1927	Yarmouth	
Lincoln	Mar., 1929	Barnstable	June, 1929		
Westwood	Mar., 1929	Attleboro	May, 1930		
Revere	July, 1929				
Winthrop	Oct., 1929				